UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

ARMISTICE NUMBER

VOLUME CXXIV NUMBER 5

Chicago, November 6, 1939

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES F. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 67
Jottings—J. H. H. 69
ARTICLES—
The Challenge to Pacifists—Symposium:
Why I Am Still a Pacifist—CLARENCE R. SKINNER 70
Some Reasons for Pacifist Optimism—RICHARD B. GREGG .. 71
The Discipline of Wartimes—VIDA D. SCUDDER 72
What We Can Do—JOHN HOWARD MELISH 73
Forward, Pacifists!—JESSIE WALLACE HUGHAN 73
On the Duty and Opportunity of Pacifists—ANNIE E. GRAY 74
"Peace without Victory"—HENRY W. PINKHAM 75
Fight in Front Line Trenches!—GEORGE MAYCHIN STOCKDALE 75
On the Pacifist Front—II 77
Peace Declarations 78
Gandhi Reaches Seventy!—RATTAN S. SEKHON 83
POETRY—
Armistice Sunday 1939—EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE 76
CORRESPONDENCE—
How to Keep America Out of War—KIRBY PAGE 84
A Letter from Sweden—H. P. M. 84
Franz Ferdinand and Sarajevo—P. M. MATTHIEFF 84
UNITY the Best of All—B. 84
THE FIELD—
The Churches in Wartime—*The Unitarian and Free Christian Monthly*, October, 1939 66

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The Churches in Wartime

The forebodings expressed in last month's editorials have, alas, become fact. After twenty years of praying and working for peace and good will among men, we members of the Christian Churches see all our hopes blighted by the outbreak of war: a war on the duration and outcome of which it is almost futile to speculate.

The emergency of war has been carefully prepared for during many months. Nevertheless the coming of war conditions themselves has fallen upon us with a sickening shock. Declaration of war in 1914 had little dislocating effect upon church life. In many respects it stimulated it; there were so many charitable activities which churches and congregations might undertake: the organization of working parties to provide comforts for combatants, socials for men on leave, special services of prayer, and so on. This time the social life of the nation is most effectively disintegrated at the outset. In evacuation areas meetings after dark, or even at dusk, are to be avoided. Without air-raid shelters on church premises, or in close proximity to them, evening activities for any large number of members at once are not to be countenanced. The stringent orders for the nightly universal black-out necessitate the holding of services at early and unusual times. But the evidence is already unmistakable that church life is expected to go on, and that church worship itself is felt to be an urgent need. Some churches are already being kept permanently open during daylight for the use of those who wish to pray in them. Some are already holding brief daily services of prayer for peace, and of intercession for those in danger, trouble, and anxiety.

There has been some tendency once more to preach the gospel of the Righteous War. Our country, it is declared, never fought in a more righteous cause; therefore, it is argued, our struggle is for the Kingdom of God, and God himself must be blessing our arms. We hoped, however, that the Gospel of the Righteous War, however ready men may be to hear it, would not be preached so blatantly as it was in 1914 when the pulpits so often became recruiting platforms.

Let there be no mistake here. We do not mean for a moment that the cause for which our country is at war—bringing to an end the domination of an aggressive Fascist government—is an unrighteous cause; but to preach in any way that may seem to imply that war itself is righteous, when Christians should be realizing more deeply than ever before that all war is supremely unrighteous and a denial of the will of God—such preaching is not worthy of a Christian Church, and will not in the long run bring credit to the Christian Church.

For no Christian can find himself or his country entering upon a war without the gravest fears and misgivings, without the keenest searchings of conscience. And so, while the utterances of the Prime

(*Continued on page* 82)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXIV MONDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1939 No. 5

A NEW CHRISTIANITY

The last word does not belong to the poison-gas philosophers and the sabre-rattlers. Not all are going to bend the knee to Baal. The struggle that is coming is a struggle for man. In that struggle Christianity will triumph, "for Christianity alone stands for man and the freedom of the human personality and social justice and the fraternization of the peoples and enlightenment of human existence." But that triumphant Christianity will not be the Christianity we know. The old Christianity, which identified itself with this world, will perish with that world. It has been weighed and found wanting. It will be a new Christianity that comes up from the depths of the catacombs of suffering and sorrow. Its apostles will be the martyrs and saints of a new religion that will solve the elementary problems of human existence, the conquest of economic slavery and poverty and peace. . .

PIERRE VON PASSEN, in *Days of Our Years*

HYPOCRISY!

What gets us is the hypocrisy of this proposal to change the Neutrality Law by raising the embargo restrictions on arms, ammunitions, and implements of war. Of course, there are positions on this question which are perfectly honest. We have respect for two! On the one hand, there is the position of men and women who are clear in their conviction that Britain's war against Germany is a war for civilization, and who say frankly that America should get into this war, and that the repeal of the embargo is one step to this end. On the other hand, is the position of those who hate war, "the concentration of all human crimes" (to quote William Ellery Channing!), who despise this war as the latest chapter in an unending imperialist struggle, who want America to stay out of this war at any price, and who would retain the embargo as one means of staying out. In between these two groups are a great mass of opponents of the embargo whose attitude, it seems to us, is just plain, downright hypocrisy. It might be muddleheadedness, but many of these people are too able to be muddleheaded. What these people want is to line up America on the Allied side of the European struggle, *but do not say so.* On the contrary, they prate about peace, and argue that lifting the embargo is a way to keep peace in terms of American neutrality. We believe in smoking these people out, and here is a way to do it! If Germany were at this moment in control of the seas and thus sending her freighters to our ports for cargoes, would they be calling upon Congress to repeal the embargo? Or, if repeal is carried, and Hitler later on destroyed the British fleet, and took over maritime mastery of the globe, would they not call instantly for the reënactment of the embargo, that Germany might not equip herself on our shores for battle against the Allies? Apply these test questions to the administration, and do they not reveal at once what the White House is really doing? We have no objection to honest militarists, who want to get into this war—we have always been able to get along with them! What we object to are the hypocrites who talk peace, and never fail to line up in favor of what makes for war.

A HOLY WAR!

The drive to make this war a Holy War is on. Indeed, it began some time ago, before the war itself had begun, as Professor Charles A. Beard points out in his *Giddy Minds and Foreign Quarrels.* Says Professor Beard (pp. 53-54):

> His [President Roosevelt's] message to Congress in January (1939) vibrated with emotions connected with foreign tumults and asserted that the United States is directly menaced by "storms from abroad." These storms, the President said, challenge "three institutions indispensable to Americans. **The first is religion. It is the source** of the other two—democracy and international good faith." Evidently he was clearing the way to make the next war a real holy war.

What the President was then preparing is now at hand. Poland, for example, is being presented as a holy cause. It would seem to be well-nigh impossible to make a case for Poland. The spawn of the villainous Versailles Treaty, Poland was a despotism of the most cruel and terrifying description. Its people were ground down into the most abject ignorance and poverty. It persecuted the Jews with an even more ghastly ruthlessness than the Reich itself. And when Czechoslovakia was seized and subjected by the Reich, it was Poland which jumped upon the helpless nation, like a hungry jackal, and tore away Teschen for its own devouring. All this is not to justify Hitler for his wanton invasion of a neighbor state. It is only to disclose the facts about a land now sentimentalized beyond all recognition by the Allied propagandists. As a matter of fact Poland plays the same role in this war that Belgium played in the last war; it is Britain's moral cloak for her latest imperialistic war. And now, in the Congress debate, are we getting the first "guff" about this European fight being a struggle for democ-

racy, and civilization, and every other precious thing that can be named. It is the old trick that worked so beautifully a quarter of a century ago. Senator Borah, of course, stated the real truth of the situation when, in his speech opening the neutrality debate, he declared that "the present war in Europe is nothing more than another chapter in the bloody volume of European power politics." But we will not have it so. It is a holy war, a crusade to save the world! If this idea prevails, sooner or later America will be seduced into the war. Nothing can keep us out. Hence, the necessity of scorching this holiness business early!

THE BEGINNINGS OF HYSTERIA

The pacifist movement is holding fast in this country—indeed, it shows a strength and resolution altogether amazing. But steadily, like frothy waves beating on a cliff, there mounts the tide of hectic feeling on the part of those who dally with war. It is always so! Make any slightest concession to war, and like the mandrake root, it puts madness in the blood. Thus, our embargo repealers are already beginning the miserable business of calling their opponents "Hitlerites" and "pro-Nazis." Colonel Lindbergh, utterly devoted to the highest American interests, and following staunchly in the footsteps of his heroic father who to the bitter end opposed this country's entrance into the last war—and the end *was* bitter!—even Colonel Lindbergh is being denounced as an emissary of the Fuehrer, and, by no less a person than Dorothy Thompson, accused of desiring Germany's victory in this war. In our own humble case, hardly a day passes but what the mail brings us abusive letters vilifying our pacifism as a cloak for Nazi propaganda. "Paid agent of Berlin" is as common a slander today as it was a quarter of a century ago. The thing is so silly, so obvious a revelation of the childish mentalities of the persons indulging in these attacks, that it would be laughable if it were not so dangerous. If supposedly sane persons are already losing their heads over this war when the fighting has hardly begun, what will be the situation when the full tide of conflict has been let loose? When beloved cities are bombed, when thousands of civilians are blown into bits, when the western front becomes a bath of blood, when the Allies perhaps begin to lose the war, when terror walks the earth and rides upon the wings of air, then what will happen? We know from the last war what happened—the madness, the fury, the ferocity of a people raving as though insane. The same thing will happen again, only as much worse as this war is worse than the last war. There is nothing for sane people to do but await the storm, as New Englanders a year ago awaited the onslaught of the hurricane from Florida. Always must we ourselves remain calm, cool, compassionate, and unfaltering in our determination to "keep the faith."

A HERO

We are a pacifist—but we know a brave man in war when we see one. Such a man was the late Mayor of Warsaw, Stefan Starzynski—not a soldier but a civilian who refused to run away and desert his people, when the enemy came storming against his city. The defense of Poland, a saga of military heroism upon the part of the common soldiers and the common people, was a thing of blackest shame and disgrace upon the part of the officers of army and government. Within a few days after the invasion, when the Poles, overwhelmed by the vast power of the German machine, were fighting doggedly inch by inch at enormous cost of death and wounds, the Polish commander-in-chief and most of his generals and lower officers, turned tail and ran for the border. Through all those dreadful last days, the Polish army fought without leaders. In the same way the government deserted. The President, his Prime Minister, his Cabinet, most of the lower executives, the legislators, mayors and councilmen of cities, abandoned their posts long before the German advance guards made their appearance, and crossed neutral frontiers into safety. These cowardly men are now in Paris, some of them in Budapest—all of a sudden very brave in their resolve to reorganize their government and carry on! But the Mayor of Warsaw did not join these runaways. Like the captain of a sinking ship he had the idea that he, as Mayor, should be the last person and not the first to leave his city. So he stood by, and day after dreadful day led and comforted his people. In the morning, and through the hours of the day, he would visit the trenches and speak with the soldiers, make the round of the homes and comfort the housewives, visit the hospitals and the refuges for children—and then every night he would send out his voice over the radio, to tell the world that Warsaw was still there. To the very moment of surrender, Starzynski stood his ground. Nothing could daunt him; no bombing drive him away. So long as his people remained, he must remain! And now, his work done, we read in the New York *Times* the report of his suicide—"the day after the Polish capital surrendered to the German armies," says the United Press dispatch. Some day Warsaw will be restored to its people. Then we trust that in the central square, or market-place, now ruined, there will be reared, for all to see, an heroic statue to Stefan Starzynski, the man who did not run away, worthy successor of the immortal Thaddeus.

PROPAGANDA DETECTION

How to detect propaganda? Can it be done by the untrained newspaper reader? Let us answer this question, if we can, by appeal to the "case system"—by taking a story and analyzing its character! Not so long ago there was published in the Chicago *Daily*

News, a sensational story to the effect that Dr. Kurt von Schuschnigg, former Austrian premier, was being slowly beaten to death by Nazi police. Daily Dr. Schuschnigg is being asked by his jailers to sign an appeal to Austrians to support the war. "When he refuses," says the report, "he is clubbed until he loses consciousness." What are we to say about this story? Are we to believe it or not? In favor of the dispatch is the fact that it was signed by Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Paris correspondent of the *Daily News.* Mowrer is not only one of the most famous but also one of the most trustworthy of all American correspondents in Europe. Favorable also is the fact that the story is vouched for by "authentic sources." This is a phrase which means something when written by Mowrer. Thirdly, there is the fact that the world knows that Schuschnigg is confined in the Hotel Metropole in Vienna, and that brutal beatings of prisoners are a part of the accepted technique of Nazi jailers. But there are other facts attaching to this dispatch which are not so favorable. Thus, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, experienced and highly trained correspondent as he is, is yet notoriously anti-Nazi. He has suffered at the hands of the Nazis, and has reason for his hate. Can any man wholly divorce his judgment from his emotions? Was not Mowrer glad to get this story, and thus prejudiced in its favor? Again, unnamed "sources," even when described as "authentic," must be regarded with suspicion when relaying information via Riga, Budapest—and Paris. Thirdly, why should the Nazis find it so important to get Schuschnigg's *bona fide* signature on an appeal to Austrians to support the war? Schuschnigg is held *incommunicado.* Why not forge his signature and publish the appeal? Would a gang which burned down the Reichstag to trap the Communists balk at forging a signature, or go to such extraordinary trouble to get a genuine signature? Lastly, Dr. Schuschnigg is valuable to the Nazis—can they risk his death in this fashion? What, therefore, to believe? We do not know. But we propose to cultivate assiduously a healthy skepticism.

ROMAIN ROLLAND SUPPORTS THE WAR!

This war is full of heartbreaks. None of them has been to us so personally devastating as Romain Rolland's renunciation of the pacifist ideal, of which he has been one of the bravest and surely the most eloquent exponent for more than quarter of a century. We still cannot seem to believe that the report of Rolland's action is really true, yet have the very words of a letter signed by his hand, endorsing the war and pledging aid to the French government, been brought to us. It was perhaps inevitable. Rolland is old, and he is sick; only a year ago he returned to his native land from his long exile in Switzerland. We imagine that a second exile was too much for him to contemplate. Also, we now remember, Rolland has for a long time been an apologist for force and violence in Soviet Russia. Instinctively attracted to the hope of the revolution and its new regime for humankind, he did what many another liberal was persuaded to do—namely, find reasons and justifications for monstrous deeds of cruelty and terror. Such concessions have their influence—they corrode the soul, and rot the fibres of moral being. But, even so, we never thought that Romain Rolland would support a war! Nonetheless, though our heart is well-nigh broken, we find the name of Rolland still sweet upon our lips. Nothing that he does now can undo what he did and said a quarter of a century ago, when his mind was clear, his spirit fresh, and his stand against iniquity undaunted. We have taken down again, from one of the most precious shelves in our library, our worn and pencil-marked copy of *Above the Battle,* Rolland's undying classic of pacifist idealism, and read again its noble pages. To this we have added again his *The Forerunners* and *Cherambault,* and have spelled out through blinding tears their words of undimmed comfort and inspiration. The Romain Rolland of 1939 cannot kill the Romain Rolland of 1914. The record stands! What is true is *true!* We lay again at Rolland's feet our tribute of veneration and love. We see him not as he is, but as he was, and as humanity will remember him forever.

Jottings

"My chief wish at the moment is that I may live to see Hitler hanged—not that I wish him any harm."

Letter in the Boston *Herald.*

No—not any harm! Only a little pain in the neck.

German shock-troops are now wearing armor and helmets weighing thirty pounds per man. Thus does time roll steadily back into the past! And why not, when the Maginot and Siegfried Lines are nothing but walls around countries instead of cities? Only the romance and chivalry of the old days seem not to return.

"Hitler has brought our people together with a common purpose. He has ended political strife. He has settled the railway strike."

Daily Express (London)

In other words, Hitler is a real benefactor of the English people.

A huge consignment of armor plate manufactured in the United States recently reached Russia—"to the great satisfaction of Soviet naval officials," says the Rumanian newspaper, *Semnalul.*

Thus does Uncle Sam lend a hand to Uncle Stalin!

In a recent symposium edited by Mr. Clifton Fadiman, entitled *I Believe,* contributors from various countries unite in expressing a fundamental faith in man. In view of what is going on in the world these days, we count the faith that could remove mountains as nothing to this.

One hundred and fifty thousand Tyrolese are being called upon to decide whether they will emigrate into Germany and live under Hitler, or stay where they are and live under Mussolini. Merciful heaven—what a Hobson's choice!

J. H. H.

The Challenge to Pacifists

[UNITY has asked certain outstanding pacifists in this country to contribute to a symposium discussion of the general problems of pacifism in wartime. The first articles received are published herewith, and represent a notable contribution to the discussion of the idealistic peace cause. Other articles will follow in later issues of this paper.

We ask the sympathy and support of our readers in securing new subscriptions and thus enlarging the bounds of our stalwart band.—*Editor.*]

WHY I AM STILL A PACIFIST

Clarence R. Skinner*

Most pacifists, in fact most minority groups, must frequently ask themselves, are we right or are we simply stubborn? Have we closed our minds to facts as they are, and are we living in a purely subjective world of things as they ought to be? Does our intransigent attitude do any good? Are we not anti-democratic in holding out against what the world apparently has accepted as its philosophy of life? These and many more questions must frequently rise into the pacifist's consciousness to haunt his waking and sleeping hours.

These statements are made in order to assure the reader that my own views are not held without careful scrutiny and, above all, that they are not promulgated in any dogmatic spirit. Like any other normal human being, the pacifist yearns to be recognized by his fellows as a loyal citizen and a realist. If he incurs the displeasure and suspicion of others, it is only after deliberate and solemn choice. I for one am a pacifist because I cannot see any other position to take.

In order to give a fairly systematic account of my own views, I might act as *advocatus diaboli,* ask certain questions of myself and then try to answer with an apologia.

Question. Do you not think Hitlerism is wrong and that it should be destroyed?

Answer. Yes, I think that the quality of civilization that has developed in Germany under Hitler is a dangerous threat to the world. It would be a tragedy if it should spread farther. It is positively medieval in many respects but it fails to have the virtues of the Middle Ages. It should be stamped out, and the sooner the better from my point of view.

Question. Then do you not believe that war is justified when it is aimed at such a threat?

Answer. No, for in my own opinion, Hitlerism is the product of war, and instead of curing Hitlerism, more wars will make more Hitlerism probable. Europe's condition today is mostly due to the debacle of 1914-1918. The economic, social, and moral structure of the Continent could not rebuild itself after the terrible destruction. If another long and exhausting struggle is to be entered into with the same train of starvation, hate, and revenge, I shudder to think what will result.

Question. Do you not want England and France to win rather than Germany?

Answer. Will I be bombed if I say that I am not sure that I do? The reason for that statement is because I am frankly afraid of what follows a military victory by anybody. Look at our South, look at Spain. Remember what the Versailles Conference did. Did not a man named Wilson once coin a phrase "Peace without Victory"? If he could have carried out that idea I believe that Europe might have been saved most of the terrible experiences of the last twenty years. It is time to reiterate the phrase and to make it a reality.

Question. Do you not think that war, even if we do not like it, is the only resort we have?

Answer. No, I believe that if war once had validity, as it might have had, it has lost its reason for being. Malinowski, in his Harvard Tercentenary address, made clear that we have now reached a point in the development of culture when war is self-defeating. Could anything be more obvious today than that fact? History has never provided us with anything more completely ironical than a war to save democracy turning into a wave of the worst kind of authoritarianism. Is it rational to expect anything out of a new war other than an ironical defeat of the very things we call our objectives?

Question. But is it not pure selfishness on the part of American pacifists to stay out of war when others are dying for what we believe to be right?

Answer. It might be unadulterated selfishness if all we cared about was our own comfort and money. There are some who oppose war for mean and provincial purposes, but such is not the case with the true pacifist, whose anti-war attitude springs from a fundamentally altruistic philosophy. The real lover of peace believes that America's great role in this crisis is to be ready for mediation, conciliation, and, above all, for saving civilization in the western hemisphere. Those who are opposing war must be willing to do some real sacrificing for peace.

Question. Is not a pacifist insensitive to moral issues? Is he not indifferent to the struggle, and is he not an obstructionist when the world is burning?

Answer. I suppose we should not refuse to answer questions about moral issues when propounded by

*Dean, Crane Theological School, Tufts College, Massachusetts; clergyman and author.

the devil. The pacifist thinks that he is more sensitive than the militarist to ethical issues. It is his very horror and hatred of bloodshed, rapine, destruction, and misery that makes him a pacifist. Such things cannot seem right and just, even when they are motivated by a desire to do justice. There is a moral law which claims that those who take the sword shall perish by the sword; and violence, instead of curing violence, increases it. The pacifist is not standing idly by while the world is burning. He is trying to prevent the fire from spreading, by insisting upon maintaining reason and sanity.

Question. Just what does a pacifist propose to do in the present conflict?

Answer. He will try to keep a balance which enables him to see clearly the truth. He will insist upon freedom to hear and speak on all aspects of the war. He will refuse to hate Germans, Japanese, or Russians. He will maintain a vigil not of neutrality but of brotherhood. He will work for a revolution through which the Germans can achieve responsible, decent government. He will work for justice in England, France, and the United States. He will try to organize the world in a genuine league, not of conquerors but of law. He will urge the great mass of the folk in all nations to unite in throwing off the yoke of chauvinism, dictatorships, and selfish economic systems. Above all, he will keep on insisting, now and for the next ten thousand years, that war is futile, wasteful, and wrong—this war and every other war, and that we must recognize this fact sooner or later. Let us do it now.

SOME REASONS FOR PACIFIST OPTIMISM

Richard B. Gregg*

Toward the close of the war of 1914-1918 General Smuts said, "Mankind has struck its tents and is once more on the march." That remark is a partial clue to the meaning of the present series of wars. What we are witnessing is fundamentally not several wars but the day of reckoning of an entire civilization and its re-casting into new forms and modes. War is the inevitable accompaniment of such change, but of the two phenomena that change is the deeper. If so, our primary questions should be not how long will the war last or how great will the losses be, but what will be the nature and extent of the changes? What can we do to help bring a better civilization to birth and successful life?

In the long run, man is guided by subtle, intangible forces such as hope, faith, self-respect, and love. We hope we will continue to live; we hope for happiness; we have faith in certain ways of living or in certain goals and powers; our self-respect and love may be limited but we cannot do without them. The apparent slightness of these forces in relation to our environment and all the rest of life provides ground for belief in one aspect of the analogy between society and an organism such as the human body. In the human body, the supply of energy, the balance of forces, the effectiveness of action, even the intelligence, are all largely dependent upon the circulation of extraordinarily minute quantities of hormones, oftentimes less in volume than one part in tens of billions, that is to say, a smaller ratio than that between one man and the entire remaining population of the world. So in society, very small numbers of certain kinds of people may play a far greater part than is usually realized. This fact is what lies back of the story of God promising Abraham to spare the City of Sodom if only ten good men were found in it; of Jesus' words, "Ye are the salt of the earth"; and in modern times, the amazing influence of one man, Gandhi.

If this be so, pacifists must not be discouraged just because they are few. The central ideas of their faith are not political in the sense of depending upon the instant support of a great majority. What counts is not the quantity of present acceptance of such ideas and actions, but their quality. The influence of such ideas and actions will be apparently smothered for awhile. Pacifists will be like caisson workers down in the dark and the muck, far below the surface, unseen and unhonored. But if they are faithful to their trust, they will be laying the foundations for a future civilization. By this I do not mean any smug self-righteousness. The activating ideas of non-violence are desperately difficult to live up to. Any trace of smugness is so completely inconsistent that the moment it enters in, the influence of non-violence flies out of the window and is gone completely. Any individual pacifist may be as inconspicuous and should be as humble as were the original disciples of Jesus or Mohammed, but the central ideas and practices of pacifism are of incalculable importance.

As to the nature of pacifists' work, it seems to me that the forces of society are so complex and their interplay so largely unknown that nobody can draft a correct blueprint of the structure of the new order. But relying on the axiom that the nature of the means determines the nature of the ends actually achieved, pacifists should devise and practice social, economic, educational, and political processes which express in daily action such forces as tolerance, a conviction that the similarities between people are more important than their differences,—that is, a belief in the unity of mankind, mutual respect, and self-respect, a belief that there is in every person a potentiality for good, a spark of the divine which can be stimulated and made to grow into controlling power. These must be the characteristics of a better civilization. Such processes, because of the circumstances of wartime, can operate only on a small scale. They must be humble and simple and related in an easily understandable pattern so that when the time comes they can, by example, percolate among the masses. These processes should include activities which give immediate satisfactions of sense, emotion, intellect, and action.† They must be such as will act not from the top down, but from the grass roots up. At present the energies of people are too much frustrated and diverted into channels of resentment, fear, anger, pride, greed, and divisiveness. The energy cannot be destroyed. We must provide adequate, socially desirable channels for it. That is the way to make enduring peace.

It seems to me that pacifists have good grounds for optimism when the war ends. The attitude of the masses of all countries toward war for the past two or three years makes it probable that even stronger than the vast hatreds and bitterness which war engenders, is the desire for some significance to life. The totalitarian nature of modern war as well as its indiscriminateness and monstrous destructiveness will mean, I believe, that only a civilization which has non-violence

*Author of pacifist books and pamphlets; friend and disciple of Gandhi.

†For a little beginning see my *Training for Peace.* (Lippincott, Philadelphia. 15c.)

as one of its major emphases can, after the war, appeal as an ideal to mankind and give significance to life. Perhaps one of the greatest gifts of science and modern machine technology will be the dramatization of the complete folly and futility of organized violence. The choice between non-violence and the barbarism and chaos of modern war may be precarious, but I incline to believe that mankind will prefer non-violence, and will set about making it a practical reality. The responsibility and opportunity for making easy such a choice rests upon pacifists.

THE DISCIPLINE OF WARTIMES

Vida D. Scudder*

How comforting it would be, in the present "distress of nations, with perplexity," to be either a naïve absolutist or an equally naïve believer in good hard fighting for a "righteous" cause! Either secure shelter is denied to some of us. With Reinhold Niebuhr, we realize that blanket application of the doctrine of non-resistance may "prompt moral complacency rather than contrition," and may erect a wall between us and the realities of mortal life. Yet at the same time we cannot escape a certain voice sounding down the ages, and we know that the Crucified, not the soldier, saves the world. . . . "With perplexity"—the succinct phrase is startlingly adequate.

We must be thinking together; the most hesitant mind dares not keep silence. At present, let me say immediately, my personal attitude is that of the absolutist, though whether I should stand a test I do not know.

Help to counteract that insidious demon of complacency is afforded by Richard Gregg's last pamphlet, *Pacifist Program in Time of War*. He begins by putting firm foundations under our feet: "War is an inherent, inevitable, essential element of the kind of civilization in which we live. . . . The only way to do away with it is to change, non-violently and deeply, the motives, functions, and structures of our civilization." Words to be pondered, one by one. The increasing ability of pacifists to recognize their truth and to ally themselves with constructive revolutionary forces is to me the most cheering fact at the outset of this second phase in the convulsion through which much in our past cultures will obviously be transformed if not destroyed. Contrast is sharp between this wide, grave outlook, and the often thin pacifism of 1914-1918. Admirably, Mr. Gregg elaborates the consequence; he only has the right to witness actively to pacifism today who has been busy in the past with some form of constructive social thought or action. The pamphlet, which it is to be hoped most of us have read, continues with keen discussion, these conditions being fulfilled, of occupations legitimate for the pacifist in wartime. We may not agree with all the fine distinctions: between making surgical dressings, for instance, and nursing in a government hospital. But the pacifist can only be grateful for the cogency of the advice as a whole. I shall not repeat what has been so well done; I pass to some things that have pressed on my mind during its recent oscillations.

1. The evolutionary and relative character of every ethical code. The highest morale is beset by the sharpest perils; pacifism, we all know, can too easily spell cowardice or evasion. F. O. R. members in China could not have wished the Chinese to suffer the Japanese invasion. The same thing holds in the West; no nation is Christian enough to have a right to the pacifist position. Nor need pacifists deny themselves the consoling assurance that the heart of God rejoices today in the heroic courage and sacrificial ardor shown by some at least of each and every nation,—qualities released by war as in no other way. Tides of good as well as evil run fuller, freer, in catastrophic epochs than in times of peace.

2. "Each and every": one notes an inference,—the absence of partisanship. This may be conducive to a low rather than high type of pacifism, for it may lead to perilous and negative cynicism. But it may also lead to that release from hate which, from our President down, is so well urged on us. Some of us are sorrowful. For we criticize most sadly where we love most dearly (I am thinking of England and France), and we cannot see much difference among imperialisms. Our sense of evil in moribund capitalism all over the world inhibits us from making clear-cut distinctions. In common with all sensitive and democratic minds, we are shocked by the obvious horrors of purges, concentration camps, and other invasions of personal liberty; but we are troubled by more covert and deeper-seated evils, from which our own country is no more exempt than any other. If our attitude results in enhanced penitence, it is good; if in refusal of activity, it is bad. Here is a call to self-examination.

3. As to personal behavior, I can add nothing to Richard Gregg. But I would underline the inner activities which he stresses, and his summons to make them more dynamic. Prayer is the supreme inner action. How constant it should be in days like these, how intense, how pure! Who knows what power it releases? Pick up the morning paper. Pause to project toward God your sympathy for the dying; accompany them, sustain them, on their dark, sudden journey. Pray that the vision may be clarified of all those "enemies" misled by false ideals. (Even Hitler, as *Mein Kampf* shows, has flashes of such idealist passion as the paranoiac may know, and Stalin may not be wholly traitor to the best in Russia.) The interior life today is intensely dramatic, charged with responsibility. Let us give thanks (a little grim?) for the inner disciplines it offers, for the enhancement and purification of our every desire and emotion. Love your enemy! Here is no simple precept, but a challenge to every power of mind and heart.

4. Look beyond ourselves, to the destiny of nations. History is unrolling, somber, menacing, before our eyes. Where does the pacifist see hope?

Not, we gravely think, in any end to be achieved by violence. It is currently pointed out that no one, whatever the issue, can "win" this war. Forces vaster than we know are at work; it is not given us to forecast the outcome. But forever, to the Christian, the patient Cross stands on the skyline of history, of the world. Only sacrificial love can save man, or nation. Pacifism without sacrifice is inert, worthless, cheap. Imbued with sacrifice, it might well bring slow salvation to our anguished civilization of the West. Where do I look for an instrument to declare it? A guide competent so to clarify our political vision that we may discern the Way of Light that shines from and to the Cross, in the world darkness? I dream that the Churches of Christ, forgetting their paltry divisions, may unite in discovering that Way for modern men, and in setting upon it, as never before, the feet of their children.

*Professor Emerita at Wellesley College; distinguished teacher and author.

WHAT WE CAN DO

John Howard Melish*

The world is such that every nation is dependent upon other nations. Autarchy is an impossibility. When a nation goes to war, its needs create an opportunity for sister nations. Since it is willing to pay any price for supplies, every nation is subjected to the temptation of profit. Moreover, the nation at peace finds unemployment of its own people on the increase because of the cessation of ordinary production. In seeking work for its nationals, it yields to the temptation to create the supplies the warring nations demand. Employers want orders, workmen want work, everybody wants prosperity. And few stop to think at what price these wants are supplied.

The peacemaker who takes the absolutist position faces this situation, and because of its very nature is bound to be in a minority. The minority may be of one; it may be of a few hundred. When he believes conscientiously that his position is right, he can do no other. Here he stands, so help him God.

Some who went through the World War as absolutists came to the conclusion that they would not do again what they did then. And when they see younger men now taking that position they cannot but wonder whether they, too, will not come out of the next war sadder but wiser.

The first difficulty in taking the absolutist position in wartime, not in peacetime, is the inconsistencies to which we are driven. Who did not have a share in the Red Cross work? And yet we have often railed against the men who are content with ambulance service on the economic front when what is needed is a direct attack on the citadel of monopoly. We found ourselves patching up wounded men in order to return them to the trenches. Everything in wartime helps or hurts morale. No man can bring himself to hurt the morale of his fellow Americans; and when he helps their morale he takes a vital part in the war. The recognition of the complexity of this situation gives a man pause.

There are more serious inconsistencies on the part of absolute peacemakers. Benjamin Franklin tells how the Quakers of Pennsylvania refused to fight the Indians but generously supplied arms to those who did fight. Professor Einstein held that 2 per cent could stop a war, but he refused to join the 2 per cent when the anti-Semitic outrage began in Germany. How many boys who took the Oxford Oath now keep it in the presence of Hitlerism? Consistency seems impossible unless a man returns to the cloister and makes his own little world. And even that world cannot long last without the world outside.

Once war has been declared, the peacemaker is driven into silence. It ill becomes us who are beyond the draft age or who have professional exemption from military service to tell men of the draft age what to do. Before the actual declaration of war we can do much to prevent war. We can advocate the more excellent way; we can expose the propaganda; we can keep the open mind and the fair judgment. After the declaration, the rest is silence.

All we can do then is to keep our souls free from hatred. It is possible to stimulate faith in the better future, to hold that international life can be built on a coöperative basis. Morality has application to nations. The assumption that a people cannot live economically until it is in a position to rule militarily is an immoral heresy. The only way, however, that the nations can convince a people who are so obsessed is to show by their action that they are willing to share the essential resources with them. There is never a time for the peacemakers to lose faith in their cause. They are to understand their cause better, and to rally around the standard of good will and coöperation.

Meanwhile our brothers are dying in Europe, on both sides, engaged in a fratricidal war. It is our war. We cannot stand aside and let them suffer without us. Nothing human is alien to us. For all we know we may be in no small part responsible. We can agonize, sympathize, try to understand, and pray. "Hope, evermore, and believe O man."

*Rector, Church of the Holy Trinity, Brooklyn, N. Y.

FORWARD, PACIFISTS!

Jessie Wallace Hughan†

These are strange days of crumbling and fear. One half the world is struggling in the chaos of war, while ardently longing for peace. Tremendous forces, idealism and profiteering hand in hand, are working to force our own America to the brink. Is it time for pacifists to sound a retreat, to yield this particular battle to Mars, and to accept the place that is numerically ours as a tiny minority striving against countless millions?

We say, no! For every headline of the international news proclaims one thing insistently to those whose vision is clear,—that the nations have taken one wrong turning after another, and that blunder will follow blunder until some strong nation dares to blaze the way to pacifism.

What has become of the non-pacifist philosophies, the solutions of the problem held out by the "practical" men for whom pacifism was too Utopian? Militarism, the conscious approval of war as a method of settling disputes, survives only as an element in Fascist dictatorship. Armed liberalism rose and fell with the League of Nations and received its deathblow at Munich. As for Communistic Internationalism—the opposition to imperialist war while condoning violent revolution—we are still standing in dazed astonishment at its downfall.

Pacifism alone remains unshaken. What we said would come to pass has come to pass, in terrible measure. Our stand is precisely what it was in 1915, when the pacifist movement was born: for the state the repudiation of all war, (including armament and the arms traffic), for the individual the refusal to support war of any kind whatever. And the way out is still the same way, unchanged since William Penn renounced all weapons but honesty and plain dealing, and held an economic conference with the devils of his time, those whom no one else dared trust.

Are we guilty of self-righteousness when we rejoice in the path in which our feet are set? There are honored pacifists who accuse themselves and us because war has come, saying that it is we and our movement that have failed. Truly we are not gods, but weak and faulty humans, who have many, many times "left undone that which we ought to have done." Yet can we sincerely go on to say that "there is no health in us"? Does not the health of the world lie definitely in the pacifist movement, and is not the disastrous mistake of the peace lovers of the world that most of them have

†Director of the War Resisters League; teacher and author.

turned aside from the simple pacifist way to follow short cuts to world order? And is not even the most ineffectual of us a bulwark (granting that he *is* a pacifist) against which the waves of war madness break in vain?

With war and conscription already upon them, our British friends are standing firm. "We Renounce All War" is the bold headline of *Peace News,* issue of September 8th. That slogan is ours also, and while we strain every nerve with other groups in the effort to keep our country out of this particular conflict, let us not forget our own peculiar task, to work uncompromisingly for the total abolition of war through the refusal of men and women to lift a finger in its support.

The near-pacifist must set his sails anew with every change in the international weather. The pacifist knows beyond peradventure that "wars will cease when men refuse to fight," and that for the individual man, though suffering and death may still be inevitable, war itself has ceased when he has refused to help by any voluntary act in the slaughter of his fellows.

ON THE DUTY AND OPPORTUNITY OF PACIFISTS

Annie E. Gray*

During my spring visit to New York when war in Europe was imminent, but had not yet reached the existing state of open hostilities, many of my friends, themselves previously ardent pacifists, but now wavering between varying loyalties, seemed to expect that I too would modify my pacifism. They did not quite know why, but "because"—and the "becauses" were legion, the chief one being that sooner or later if "Hitler were not stopped" (from grabbing all Europe) the fate of Austria, etc., would be that of America; the conscience-soothing delusion of the "defensive" war idea to the fore again!

Rarely have I heard such mixed and muddled arguments for just one more war to end all war. Under all this confusion of thought I could discern the subtle propaganda, now an established part of modern warfare, getting in its fine work. Again, we in America, just as in 1914-1918, are being battered on all sides by sensational appeals to once more get in and help England and France "save democracy." I returned to Colorado with my anti-war conviction strengthened, believing more firmly than ever that the straight and narrow path of non-violence is the only path for the pacifist to travel, that to admit one "but" into one's philosophy of peace is to be lost in the slough of disruption of one's highest and holiest ideals.

In the period of the years of 1914-1917 my conscience would have given me no peace had I not done everything in my power to point out to my fellow citizens the utter futility of United States participation in the World War, and the glorious opportunity that would in all probability be ours, when hostilities ceased, to act the part of the good Samaritan—to help bind the wounds of the bleeding—and, most important of all, to influence a just and lasting peace—a peace that would leave no seed for the growth of the next red harvest of war.

We all know *now* how the handful of staunch pacifists failed to stem the tide of sympathy, patriotism, propaganda, and greed that swept us into the war. We all know *now* how, by resorting to violence ourselves, we were rendered unworthy and incompetent to oppose the hatred and bitterness at the so-called peace table of Versailles, which produced results that have led to the present conflict. We all know *now* that the sacrifice of a hundred thousand of our finest youth and the expenditure of billions of dollars (that might have been used for constructive purposes) were all in vain! What we *actually* did was to prolong the war two years after the Central Powers were ready to make peace, and to *insure* the present war, by helping England and France to become avenging victors and thereby to impose impossible conditions upon the vanquished.

The readers of UNITY may object that the foregoing is ancient history. Yes! but we study history if we desire to correct the mistakes of the past. As I see things now, my duty is once more to point out to my fellow citizens at every opportunity the devious ways by which we were (and may be again) stampeded into supporting the government in the World War, that ran all the way from appeals to our ideals and sympathy for "little Belgium" to every kind of misrepresentation and outright untruths.

I can think of no better way to accomplish this purpose than to refer my readers to reliable authorities on the subject. First I would suggest the perusal of a little book entitled *The War Myth in United States History,* by C. H. Hamlin, published by the Vanguard Press of New York. As a second reading I recommend *The Road to War,* by Walter Millis, published by the New York *World-Telegram,* September 23 to 28, 1935, (this may be in book form); and lastly an article in a recent issue of the magazine *Forum* by Isabel Lundberg, entitled "Apostles of Defeat." This article closes with the significant words: "We may discover in letting ourselves be stampeded into a new holy war to 'save democracy' that we have followed the counsels of defeat and from the wisdom of failures reaped failure."

With that reading as a beginning and a stimulus I could hope the readers might take advantage of the democratic processes still available in our country to give the President and Congress the information that we could not be relied upon to support a new war to "save democracy." Let me here *doubly emphasize* that should we fail to exercise our democratic right to keep our country out of war, the moment war is declared all those democratic rights of which we are so justly proud would be abrogated, and America would become, equally with Germany, a dictatorship such as we would supposedly be warring upon. Let me *further emphasize* that not only would democratic rights be abrogated upon entry into war, but that the net result would doubtless be the end of all democracies.

As I see it, my duty and the duty of all pacifists, is to keep absolutely neutral in thought, word, and deed; to set our faces sternly against war *for any excuse whatsoever.*

Our opportunity, once more, is to preserve here in America such values and verities as we possess in order that we may be an aid and example to the stricken peoples of Europe when the fires of the present conflict shall have burned themselves out. There is still time and it is still our blessed duty and opportunity to work unceasingly toward the goal of coöperation and world federation, for only upon such a firm foundation may we hope to build the preservation of democracy and the survival of the human race.

*Former Director, Women's Peace Society, New York.

"PEACE WITHOUT VICTORY"

Henry W. Pinkham*

"Peace without victory"—it is time to recall President Wilson's words of January, 1917, less than four months prior to his summons to the nation to enter the World War. He said: "Victory would mean peace forced upon the loser, a victor's terms imposed upon the vanquished. It would be accepted in humiliation, under duress, at an intolerable sacrifice, and would leave a sting, a bitter memory, upon which terms of peace would rest, not permanently, but only as upon quicksand." Events proved how sadly true these words. For, by joining the great madness of Europe, the United States prolonged the war a fatal year and brought the kind of peace Wilson predicted. Its foundation on quicksand has slipped away, and again British and French are in deadly conflict with Germans, while other countries, great and small, anxiously wait and watch, fearing they will be drawn into the fray.

The war is only a little more than two months old. Has it been a happy period for any people? Not for the Poles as they bury their dead and with them their hopes of national greatness. Not for the Germans, who celebrate a shameful victory in an unequal combat but in ten thousand homes have been bereaved. Not for the French or the British, who listen by night and by day for the warning that sends them scurrying to shelters from a rain of death. Millions of men, women, and children carrying gas masks constantly!—has the human race gone crazy? War is a disgrace to humankind, as it always was; and now, through the prostitution of science to the work of destruction, it is suicidal insanity.

Early in the World War Charles W. Eliot, President Emeritus of Harvard, America's grand old man, said to a group of ministers in Boston, "Don't pray for peace yet." He insisted that the war should be fought to a finish, confident that it would demonstrate the superiority of democracy to autocracy. As time went on he advocated the participation of this country on the side of the Allies. But five months after our government had declared war, Dr. Eliot, in a letter to the New York *Times* (August 21, 1917), advocated a conference of the belligerents, in view of the fact that after three years of warfare the military situation could be described as a stalemate. He said:

> Germany in all probability can be brought to a condition of exhaustion before the Allies will be; but this result can be brought about only by prolonged and desperate sacrifice of human life and of the savings of the nations and at the cost of infinite human woe. . . . It would certainly facilitate the proceedings of an international conference in the interest of durable international peace if it could be understood beforehand that all the participating nations had come to the conclusion that war on the modern scale and with the new implements of destruction is not an available means, in the present state of the civilized world, of settling international disputes or of extending national influence and power.

"Not an available means"—what masterly understatement! Compare it with Sherman's single-word definition, or William James' "wholesale organization of irrationality and crime," or John Hay's "most ferocious and futile of human follies."

How well Dr. Eliot's plea—which fell upon deaf ears and brought him abuse—fits the present situation! Already there is practically a stalemate on the western front, neither side being willing to suffer the enormous loss required to break through the opposing fortified line. The present lull may have ended before these words are in print. No matter! The time to act sensibly is always now. And the only sensible thing to do in the midst of war is to stop killing and, like rational human beings, settle the controversy by conference, with mutual concession and condonation. For it is war itself that is the terrible destroyer. The military issue, victory or defeat, is relatively unimportant. Germany's triumph over Poland cannot restore to life the thousands of choice young men slain, of whom there were no doubt many potential geniuses who would have blessed both countries and the world. The best thing that Hitler said in his "peace offensive" speech was this: "In the course of world history there have never been two victors, but very often only losers. This seems to me to have been the case in the last war." But he did not go far enough. Not only "very often" but always, if the consequences of war be traced in all their ramifications, there are "only losers." In the long run the moral order punishes both sides with approximate equality, regardless of the military outcome. Any moral difference between belligerents is insignificant inasmuch as both sides sink below the brutes. Both sides cannot be right, but both sides can be, and always are, wrong.

President Roosevelt says: "I hate war." He has a glorious opportunity to lead the world into the path of peace, "peace without victory." Will he seize it? Why does he not offer to mediate? Why does he not ask all the neutral governments to join in an appeal to the belligerents in the name of civilization, of humanity, of common sense? And if they give no heed, why not appeal again? And yet again, if necessary? And again? And again?

> Calm words, great thoughts, unflinching faith,
> Have never striven in vain;
> They've won our battles many a time,
> And so they shall again.

*Unitarian clergyman; veteran in the peace cause in America.

FIGHT IN FRONT LINE TRENCHES!

George Maychin Stockdale†

Pacifists of America, fight in the front line trenches together with those who are not pacifists!

The front line is the fight to keep the arms embargo.

If that trench is taken by the enemy, pacifists have bomb-proof shelters and reserve lines, which militarists know not of, but which they, too, might have if they could catch the pacifist vision.

President Roosevelt's speech to Congress calling for repeal of the arms embargo can be riddled with machine-gun bullets. Here is some ammunition that no doubt readers of UNITY have noted. Supply this ammunition to your neighbors and friends instead of arguing with them to see pacifism.

1. The President calls for reliance on international law. That is what President Wilson relied on in 1914. At best it is a gossamer thread. In reality it is whatever Britain claims it to be. Who can suppose that Cash and Carry will prevent the same kind of involvement as 1914-1917 saw for us? The flag will follow trade, as it has always done in British, French, or American imperialisms.

2. Again, President Roosevelt claimed that the embargo of President Jefferson's day and the Non-in-

†Minister of Methodist Church, Clinton, New York; leader of peace movements.

tercourse Act of President Madison's first term constituted a policy that "was the major cause of bringing us into active participation in European wars in our own war of 1812."

The exact opposite happens to be the case. Look it up in any good American history. Here it is in Muzzey's *A History of Our Country* on pages 236 ff. Here is ammunition that will drive Franklin D. Roosevelt out of his repeal trench. Note that just as long as embargo under Jefferson or the Non-intercourse Act under Madison were in effect, *America was kept out of war.* Just as soon as embargo was repealed, Non-intercourse was substituted; and then the Non-intercourse Act expiring, Congress did in essence just what President Roosevelt is now asking. They let down the bars and traded with the whole world, belligerents included. That proved to be the slide into Avernus, the futile, senseless, wicked war of 1812.

David S. Muzzey, Professor of History in Columbia University, simply supplies the ammunition all historical authorities can give you. Our State of New York uses the volume referred to above for its course in American History. Pass out this ammunition quickly to all your neighbors and friends.

3. Let us bomb the ammunition dumps of the repealers. These reside in the minds of your neighbors and friends who think (1) that Britain and France are more or less innocent victims of Hitler's madness, and/or (2) that democracy is at stake if Hitler beats the Allies. Here is ammunition for driving back the repealers from such a groundless assumption.

4. Who of several firebugs that burn your home is the more responsible, the one who touches the match, or the ones who soaked your house with kerosene? Hitler touched the match. Britain, France, Poland, despite Lloyd George and Wilson, have been soaking Europe with kerosene ever since 1919. Just consider a few facts that UNITY readers know, and must not allow folks to forget. The Allies promised Germany they would disarm. They deliberately lied, did not disarm. The Allies crushed Germany, ruined the young German Republic, brought Germany to the 1923 horrors of inflation. You know these facts and many more. Tell them.

In a word, the Allies drove the Germans right into Hitler's arms. Recall to folks how Poland has been guilty of "force, bad faith, injustice, oppression, and persecution," the iniquities with which Mr. Chamberlain charges Hitler. See editorial, "The Fate of Poland" in *Christian Century* for September 20. Poland did to Russia, Lithuania, and Czechoslovakia exactly what Hitler did to the last named, to Austria, and now to Poland. We speak of its government. It was Fascist. It persecuted minorities, the Jews, as badly as does Germany. The peasants, under Beck and his "colonels' cabal," were in sore straights, so that it is no wonder that, as reported, they have welcomed Russia as a savior.

Who is worse, a boy who commits suicide, or the father who drove him to such desperation? There is no excuse for Germany trying suicide by accepting Hitler, when Gandhi had just the technique needed for triumph over their evils. However, history shows Britain still the "perfidious Albion" of yore. The belligerents all will reap the carnage and doom that they have sown.

5. Again what a grim jest to think of Britain or France as upholding democracy! They lost what traces they had when on September 3 they declared war on Germany in support of the pledge they had made to the vicious Beck government of Poland. That pledge, it now appears, was hypocritical. It is reported that all the time they knew they could not defend Poland. Before that, Britain had revived conscription, than which there is nothing more undemocratic. Chamberlain had become a virtual dictator, conferring with Dictator Daladier across the channel. Any war will kill democracy for any country.

America helped to fight in the war that made the world unsafe for democracy. Keep America out of this war, by keeping it from becoming the arsenal of one side. This leads to our sixth point.

6. We have assumed to date that if the embargo is lifted Britain and France would get nearly all the munitions America would sell.

Do not be too sure.

Why did Adolf Hitler tell Benito Mussolini to remain neutral? May it not be so that the Duce can buy munitions from America in case the embargo is repealed? Think that one over for your friends who are not neutral but want the villains of 1914-1918 to "win" again. Then, too, what will keep Japan from buying all the munitions she can to continue to slay the Chinese, if the embargo is lifted? She is doing that now, so far as we can learn, for in the President's eyes Japan is a "neutral." Japan and Italy reshipping munitions made in America into Germany to help carry on the "war to kindle more wars"!

These things and worse seem the prospects, if the American people allow Congress to repeal the embargo on arms. Keep it, and we go a long way to keeping America out of war, not for any selfish reasons but that as a true neutral she may help to secure a just peace this time,—one that shall yet make her the blessing to the world that our Fathers dared to dream she would be.

Armistice Sunday 1939

While nations rage, while empires rock and fall,
While hatred burns and greed and war increase,
With heart and voice we dedicate our all
Once more to Thee, O mighty Prince of Peace.

Fast grow abysmal rifts in every land,
O'er creed and class, o'er wealth and soil and blood.
Through all the earth, made one in Thee, we stand,
Thy Church in its transcendent brotherhood.

Into the soon forgotten past they die,
False gods that rise and flourish for a day.
Not so Thy Cross, firm rooted in the sky;
Thy words, O Christ, shall never pass away.

While nations rage, while empires rock and fall,
While hatred burns, and greed and war increase,
With heart and voice we dedicate our all
Once more to Thee, O mighty Prince of Peace.

EDITH LOVEJOY PIERCE

On the Pacifist Front

[UNITY will publish from time to time, under this heading, such news as can be gathered about pacifists and pacifist activities in these war days. We earnestly invite our readers to send us such items of interest as may come to their attention.—*Editor*]

II.

America, a Roman Catholic journal, has taken a positive stand as a conscientious objector. A leading editorial declares:

> Needless to say this review aligns itself with those who hold that it is impossible at this moment to justify on moral grounds American participation, direct or indirect, in any war in Europe. . . . We hope that Congress and the administration will realize that millions of Americans do not admit that a war is made just when Congress declares that it is just. We had a few conscientious objectors in this country during the World War. Should another World War come, we shall have millions. One of them will be this review.

Fellowship publishes the following item in its October issue:

> Like Harold Gray during the last war, Dick Wodeman, British subject, sailed back Saturday, September 23, to take his stand in England as a conscientious objector. Dick has been a member of the Peace Pledge Union for over a year and has completely dedicated his life to the cause of peace. He had been spending the summer here at Penn-Craft, a Quaker work camp in Pennsylvania.
>
> As we stood on the pier and waved farewell we felt that the mere thought of Dick would always be a bulwark of strength in our weakness. He had said so many times: "My life would be forever meaningless to me if I did not go back and take my stand now. We have been talking about, and preparing for, this for a long time. Now we must act."
>
> We stand with you, Dick—our hearts and our prayers go with you, and with our other comrades suffering for our common cause.

The New York *Post* publishes the following story:

> "An Ace to His Son"—an interview with Ray Bridgman by a *Post* staff member. Mr. Bridgman, an instructor in New York University, was an aviator ace in the last war and received the Croix de Guerre. To quote part of what he says now to his son: "Better to go to prison than to war. If you go to prison, you will at least be fighting for an ideal." . . .
>
> "They must be told that there is more heroism in peace than in war.
>
> "They must be told that all wars are useless, that this present one in Europe is unnecessary." . . . "There would never have been any Hitler, never any invasion of Poland, if the great cheer leaders of France and England had been just men who wanted a just peace." . . .
>
> Send for this copy of the *Post* and pass it on to your friends to read.

In a public statement the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America declares:

> We call upon the churches to defend the liberties of press, platform, and pulpit which war anywhere harshly threatens, and especially to uphold that freedom of conscience without which past martyrdoms are betrayed and victory becomes defeat.
>
> We call upon the churches to pronounce war an evil thing alien from the mind of Christ. To those who for conscience' sake cannot fight, war is anathema. To those who fight for conscience' sake war is still evil, though they believe it an inescapable choice in this present evil world.

The most remarkable document, in our judgment, which has appeared since the war began, is Muriel Lester's letter to President Roosevelt, pleading with him to keep this country at peace and try to stop the conflict. Miss Lester is head of the famous Kingsley Hall settlement in East London, an Englishwoman, and a friend and disciple of Gandhi. The letter follows:

Washington, D. C.
September 16, 1939.

Dear Mr. Roosevelt:

I am an Englishwoman who comes to this country every year and is devoted to it. Mrs. Roosevelt kindly invited me to the White House on my return from China and Japan last summer. George Foster Peabody, with whom I was staying at Saratoga Springs in 1932, used often to explain the political situation to me, since when I have followed your ideas and actions closely and with deep appreciation. I wonder if you know how very high you rank in the regard of British people.

To come to the point at once I beg you not to let this country join in the European war. I want the United States to remain an area of wide sanity. It is not easy to say this because my family and friends are in the danger zone of London's East End; and also because I think the Allies are likely to be beaten. We are not so good at war as the Germans are. They are much more thorough than we. They have a genius, though an unpredictable one, to lead them. Also we have about fifty thousand of our best men outside the battle who will neither fight nor help others to fight, nor make weapons for fighting. Regularly for years they have notified the government that they are completely convinced that war defeats its own ends and is an unscientific—because unpredictable—method of settling anything. They are a minority, but a determined minority, with a faith rooted in experience.

I do not want America, however, to stand aloof from Europe. I want you to come in and make us make peace. You have tried again and again, I know. We are deeply grateful but please go on. Please do not stand on ceremony. Challenge us and our leaders, both Hitler and Halifax, every week. Point out how mad it is to destroy Europe.

Appeal to us one week for the sake of the old architecture, the cathedrals; the next for the sake of our forests, fields, and gardens; the next for the sake of youth and old age. Appeal one week to the scientists and businessmen and the next to the philosophers and parsons.

Lecture us. Make fun of us. Pull our leg. Talk plainly to us in the name of God.

And please always make the same specific offer that you'll come and help us if we stop fighting.

Yours and Secretary Hull's ideas are what Europe needs. It has been our ill fortune in years past to have men in power who were ignorant and unappreciative of the States. They have retired and you have come on the scene. Two good events.

Please show us British up, how very like Hitler we are in our race pride in India and our broken promises in Palestine. And show Hitler up, how like he is to us in his constantly assumed air of conscious rectitude.

Show us that it is no worse to covet empire than to cleave to empire. And that it's time we put our imperial territorial possessions under supernational authority in which men of honour like Francis Sayre could act.

Mr. President, your country is vast and beautiful. To be here is joy. Your people are so generous that I hate

to consider the prospect of its youth being swallowed up by the war machine.

I forget which of our Secretaries of State for India warned the Viceroy not to adopt all the advice proffered by the military. He said, "If they had their way, they would fortify the moon to protect us against Mars."

Traveling over almost the whole of your country, speaking four and five times a day—as I did in the National Preaching Mission—I meet many of your opponents as well as your supporters. Last night a rather brilliant young educationalist said, "I believe Mr. Roosevelt could swing the nation into or out of the war, whichever he chose!" I quickly enquired, "But do you think he could pull Europe out of the war?" He thought a minute and then said, "Yes."

Very sincerely,
(Signed) MURIEL LESTER.

Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, minister of the Riverside Church, New York City, said in a sermon on October 15th last:

> I speak to you as a minister of Christ who profoundly agrees with this prevalent determination [to keep America out of this war]—who, indeed, agrees with it so strongly that were the United States to go into this war, I should have to be a conscientious objector.

Two hundred Episcopalian clergymen and laymen, headed by the Rt. Rev. W. Appleton Lawrence, Bishop of Western Massachusetts, have committed themselves to the support of 100 per cent pacifism. In a conference in New York, presided over by Dr. W. Russell Bowie, late Rector of Grace Church and now Professor at the Union Theological Seminary, it was announced that "the Episcopal Church was mistakenly considered a church that could be counted upon to be nationalistic in time of war." These clergymen and laymen stated their opposition to all war, called for absolute neutrality in the European struggle, and pledged their support and sympathy to conscientious objectors.

A letter in the *Christian Century:*

The Sunday before Germany entered Poland the pastor of a small United Church chapel in a Canadian settlement, twenty miles from even a small town, preached a sermon on the sinfulness of war and then said simply, "We are told to pray for our enemies; let us now pray for Adolf Hitler." This was courageous witness in a community already permeated with the war spirit, reading newspapers that were vehemently pushing Canada into the conflict. If our turn comes, can we do as well?

Further evidence of this Canadian pastor's fine spirit is shown by the following excerpts from a later letter: "I thoroughly believe that war is sin. Any justification we may have is therefore largely in the nature of an excuse for our sinning. And while direct responsibility in the present case is upon Adolf Hitler and his advisers, yet when the full question of responsibility comes to be discussed, the present competitive system of carrying on the business of the world will be found to have a causative effect beyond that of even key individuals. . . . So in the last resort it is our own people's desires and efforts to possess material things that provide the urge which pushes our whole setup into war. Evidently the cure is renunciation for spiritual reasons. As Francis of Assisi in days long gone did and gave us all an example. But are we in the ministry ready for it? Finally it is our wives and children who are to be affected and it will be for them to assent before even ministers can lead along the way of renunciation."

Then followed this moving postscript: "We have two sons—David 24, Gordon 22. Selah!"

BRADFORD YOUNG.

Peace Declarations

The Fellowship of Reconciliation

The night of terror which is descending upon widening areas of the earth brings us deep sorrow. When our brothers suffer, we suffer in sympathy. It is difficult for them to live as they now must under the shadow of death; it is even worse for them to be faced with a situation in which there seems to be no hope. Many millions are entering the European war with the feeling that it is inescapable but that no good can come of it.

The very fact of this new war proves the tragic futility of the whole system in which nations pursue their own self-interest by militaristic and imperialistic force. In that system wars are inevitable, and war brings wholesale and ruthless destruction of the very things which nations sought to grasp. This is a fact which the nations failed to recognize adequately in the so-called "peace" written after the last World War and in the national policies of the years that followed. The continuation of the old policies inevitably brought on again the present phase of overt violence and destruction, in spite of the idealism of peoples, their horror of war, and their fervent desire for peace.

It is important at this juncture to emphasize also that war in turn arouses vindictiveness, hate, a cheap regard for the value of human life, and a scorn for idealism; and therefore, though men believe they fight for righteous ends, war leads to a "peace" of revenge and the setting up of arbitrary and unjust economic and political arrangements which contain the seeds of fresh wars.

It is the haunting recognition of these facts, together with the frightful destructiveness and the monstrous impersonalism of modern warfare, that accounts for the dull resignation, approaching despair, with which men in all lands are entering the war. Unless there is a better way, there is indeed no hope for mankind.

Under these circumstances, we believe that we are abundantly justified in warning against the tendency to fix the guilt for the present war upon some one nation or one individual of whom men make a personal devil. After the last war, when secret treaties were published, underlying economic forces were analyzed, the unreliability of the war propaganda machines of all the governments exposed, we realized how wrong and childishly inadequate had been the reading of the problem in terms of the sole guilt of one nation. The writing of the "peace" on that basis was one of the forms in which we sowed the wind from which we now reap the whirlwind. We believe that in the perspective of history Hitler is to be regarded as the child of the World War, the subsequent diplomacy, and the economic anarchy which has prevailed in the world. All nations share the responsibility and guilt of this new war—our own which has shown much more

concern, for example, about collecting war debts than with coöperation for a stable world-order; those nations that were determined to maintain the iniquitous and untenable status quo, as in Central and Eastern Europe, even if that meant plunging the world into another war; and those nations who were determined to change the situation to their advantage, even if that meant plunging the world into another war. Repentance, which begins at home, becomes us all and is the only means by which men and nations shall succeed in removing both the beam from their own eyes and the mote, or the beam, from their brothers' eyes.

Those in our land who may not agree with this point of view must nevertheless, equally with those who do, face the question: If evil is abroad in the world, how may it be effectively stopped? Our experience in the last war has conclusively demonstrated that war is not the way to stop war, to advance or conserve democracy, to move toward the building of an orderly world.

The Fellowship of Reconciliation is committed to the faith and conviction that there is a better way and that if men will commit themselves resolutely to that way, they may, even in the midst of chaos, build the foundations for the structure of a new world-order.

The basis of our faith and conviction is the belief that God rules and that moral forces are both essential and ultimate in history. We believe, therefore, that when men attempt to hew out their destiny by the means of bomb and shell and economic power, or by any other of the means by which they do violence to their brothers, they bring upon themselves defeat and chaos.

But we believe also that men may learn how to live together as brothers in peace and justice and how to overcome evil if they will study and practice the Way of Jesus. To us, this means the way of compassion, forgiveness, and reconciliation, of overcoming evil by good, of redemptive suffering. This is the path of the suffering servant of Jehovah envisioned by Israel's prophets—the Way of the Cross. We believe that war is incompatible with this Way.

Such was the faith and conviction upon which the F. O. R. was founded twenty-five years ago in the midst of the World War, upon which it has continued through the intervening years, and to which we re-dedicate ourselves in this hour. Often we have not, in our personal lives or in our social actions, been fully true to this our faith, and therefore we share the guilt for the tragedy which has overtaken mankind. It is upon ourselves first and not upon the "warmakers" that we pronounce judgment. Nevertheless, we believe and know that the humble, confident witness of good will which suffers and does not resort to hate or the violent destruction of others, is the divine way and is not futile. It is the price of reconciliation among men and of every effective and lasting victory over evil. It is a value which a moral universe conserves. It was not Jesus who perished, but Caesar, Barabbas, Pilate.

Since we are committed to a way of life and a policy of human relationships, including those between nations, with which war is incompatible, we make the following urgent recommendations:

Our first concern must be that the United States should make a constructive contribution to the building of a new world-order. To this end we urge the government to take the initiative in consolidating a large bloc of neutral countries to offer continuous mediation in order to restore peace, to build it on just and firm foundations, and to establish the beginnings of political and economic coöperation after the war.

In this work, the defeat suffered by past idealism must be avoided by constant emphasis:

1. Upon peace conferences democratically set up and under civilian and not military control;

2. Upon a peace which really tackles basic economic problems such as tariffs, currency wars, equal access for all peoples to raw materials, internationalization of control of colonies, and so forth—a peace in the making in which the United States must be prepared to contribute its full share of coöperation;

3. Upon the necessity of taking effective steps toward some form of federal world-government based not upon violence but upon economic and social justice.

The only hope that such a peace can come out of the war depends on having a significant bloc of nations not involved in the war. It is for this reason, and not the ground of a dream of isolation or a desire to save our own skins, that we urge redoubled efforts to keep the United States out of the war and advocate such measures as the following to preserve and extend democracy in the United States in order that we may help to restore or extend it throughout the world:

1. Strengthening our neutrality policy by invoking it in the Japanese-Chinese war and extending it everywhere to cover key war materials such as copper and oil, using perhaps the method of a three or five year peacetime average to determine export quotas. Granting the technical difficulties which this subject presents, and making no attempt to solve them here, let us strive so far as humanly possible to take this nation and people out of the business of coining blood-money from the sale of instruments of war, and let us not yield to the illusion by which we were betrayed in the last war that we can become economically involved and still not slip into military involvement. Those who do not want American lads to be sent to death in foreign lands, on the side of this belligerent or that, must not send guns and bombing planes across the seas, for tragic experience has taught that the lads will follow the guns and the planes;

2. Discouraging or preventing war profiteering not only by government action but also by personal influence and collective moral pressure;

3. Supporting the war referendum bill in Congress, as one of the ways to express and save our democracy;

4. Opposing all industrial mobilization plans and conscription laws;

5. Counteracting war propaganda by reminding ourselves and our friends that outrages are a part of war and that war itself is the greatest atrocity; that opinion may be influenced by what is not reported or said about certain nations as well as by what is reported or said; and that the unconscious distortion of a situation by prejudice is more

dangerous to fair analysis than is deliberate misrepresentation;

6. Working for moral and psychological peace as well as for the cessation of military conflict;

7. Working for the strengthening of the foundations of American democracy by support of measures which will provide useful work, especially for our youth, and put an end to an unbrotherly economic setup in which many are in want in the midst of plenty, a plenty in which others share disproportionately and to their own soul's hurt.

Grateful as we are today for the establishment of the F. O. R. during the last war, for its witness and its work through all the years, we must in this solemn gathering confess that we have often not been willing to pay the full price of being effective "peacemakers," therefore we must now:

1. Deepen our own spiritual life and improve our intellectual equipment by a more severe discipline in prayer and work, in personal relationships, in the cultivation of humility (not least toward fellow-Christians and those in the peace movement who may not see eye to eye with us), intensifying our work as individuals and groups for human betterment and reconciliation in the community. Pacifists must more than ever be workers and practical friends, and not mere talkers, in every church and community;

2. Work out and practice more intensively and generally the small group or pacifist action fellowship technique;

3. Perfect local, state, and regional organization of F. O. R., and coöperation of F. O. R. with the historic peace churches, denominational pacifist groups, etc.;

4. Organize maximum support for non-partisan relief work such as that of the Society of Friends for refugees, prisoners of war, etc. In this connection, we urge on the F. O. R. Council and other peace agencies careful consideration of a proposal to extend the International Voluntary Service for Peace (Pierre Ceresole), thus providing for the recruiting of an "army" of young men who would pledge not only to refuse any military service but at the same time pledge to perform equivalent service of reconstruction and reconciliation, possibly for the same term as the average soldier had served, after the war;

5. Intensify such work as that begun through the Pacifist Handbook to prepare for guidance and support of pacifists of military age and their families. This is obviously a task for all the pacifist organizations, and we call on the F. O. R. Council and staff to proceed at once to consultation with all such bodies;

6. Continue full support of the International F. O. R. and the work of the Embassies of Reconciliation, and pledge our solidarity with conscientious objectors and their families in other lands, and immediately explore the possibilities of bringing them material and spiritual support;

7. One of our *distinctive* tasks as an F. O. R. is now with renewed concentration, earnestness, and humble love to present the challenge of the Christian pacifist position, our understanding of the Way of the Cross, to the Christian churches, their leaders and members. The churches through denominational statements and such ecumenical gatherings as Oxford 1937 have made great advances in this realm since the last war. They have denounced war as always evil; they have recognized that the pacifist position is at least one of the positions a Christian may take in conformity with the Bible and the doctrines of the Christian faith; and in many instances they have recognized their responsibility for moral and other support of Christian youth and others who, in obedience to Christ and conscience, refuse to support war and thus incur the persecutions of the state and misguided fellow-citizens. We must now keep the church to its duty of standing by these declarations, and the F. O. R. must nationally and locally place its services loyally at the disposal of the church to help it stand fast in the faith.

But we must also point out that events and the pressure of totalitarian states challenge the church more and more insistently to face the question of how long it can countenance *any* support whatever to war, how long it can maintain a position which in practice implies extending the blessing of Christ both to the Christian youth who refuses to participate in war and his brother who, in obedience to army regulations, stands this conscientious objector against the wall and shoots him.

The church is called to be the universal fellowship of believers transcending bounds of nation, race, and class. A church which in fidelity to this vocation and which in the name of the crucified Christ were to take leadership in the renunciation of all war and place all its trust in the Way of the Cross, would be persecuted by the Caesars and Caesarisms of our own day; but into that persecuted church, as into the church of the early Christian centuries, would pour the masses of men who are wearily waiting for the dawn of peace.

Because of this conviction, we rejoice to be able to announce that under the chairmanship of Harry Emerson Fosdick plans are proceeding for the series of regional Christian pacifist conferences throughout the nation which was tentatively projected last spring. It is the sense of this Conference that our officers and Council should regard the planning of these conferences, and our members the promotion of them in their denominations and in their home localities, as a major task.

Firm in our faith in the way of peace and in the God of Love, and remembering in gratitude and affection those who bore witness to this F. O. R. faith in the last war, we dedicate ourselves now to the daily practice of this faith in repentance, humility, love, and joy.

National Women's Trade Union League

The peace work of the National Women's Trade Union League in recent years has been based on the belief that some day there must, and will, be a world in which international law and order will be maintained by peaceful means, and that war will be entirely outmoded as a method of settling disputes between nations. To this end we have worked for social justice in our own country, for closer friendship between the United States and our neighbors on this continent, and for placing the influence of our great country behind the principle of nations keeping their pledged word with other nations.

Today the main concern of most persons in the United States is that this country shall not be drawn

into the war which has broken out in Europe. But there appears to be an appalling confusion of thought as to what will draw us in. In the first place, arms and ammunition form a very small part of modern warfare. If we keep the arms embargo and make no provision for other essential war materials we invite "incidents" such as helped to bring us into the last war, that is, the sinking of American ships carrying those essential war materials. No commodity is unimportant in carrying on present-day war, and all commodities to belligerents should therefore be treated alike. If *all* exports to belligerents were put on a "cash and carry" basis (i. e., any belligerent may buy any commodity from us provided the buyer pays cash and takes away the goods in his own ships) not only would there be no danger from the "incidents" referred to above, but the "cash" basis would keep us from becoming involved on account of the piling up of debts by any belligerent or group of belligerents.

President Roosevelt in his speech to the Congress assembled in special session on September 21 asked for revision of the Neutrality Act along the lines of Secretary Hull's 6-point program made public in May: (1) American merchant vessels should be restricted from entering war zones; (2) American citizens should be prevented from traveling on belligerent vessels or in danger zones; (3) transfer of title of all commodities sold to belligerents should be made before the goods leave our shores; (4) war credits to belligerents should be prevented; (5) collection of funds for belligerents in this country should be regulated; (6) the Munitions Control Board should continue to regulate the arms traffic. The President especially stressed points 3 and 4 (the "cash and carry" provisions) as being our most important safeguard. Let us support the President in his earnest desire to keep the United States in the path of true neutrality.

Washington Committee, Campaign for World Government

WHEREAS, the world is again witnessing the appalling destruction of human life and material with two billion human beings imperiled because statesmen have failed in building world political unity in keeping with the economic and technological unity of mankind, and

WHEREAS, the neutral nations, possessing a common desire to stay out of the war, will be strengthened in this purpose by establishing close and continuous relationships with each other, and

WHEREAS, these nations acting in coöperation can marshal world opinion so as to bring this war to the earliest possible end and ensure a just peace rather than one of vengeance; therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, by the Washington, D. C., committee of the Campaign for World Government that we respectfully urge Congress and the President of the United States to call a convention of the neutral nations empowered to present joint plans:

(a) For staying out of war.

(b) For ending the war as soon as possible by peaceful means.

(c) For inviting all nations (as proposed in House Concurrent Resolution 27 by Mr. Voorhis) to participate in the drafting of the constitution for a world federation under popular control and with delegated powers only; said federation to derive its authority directly from individuals and peoples rather than from nations and to renounce war as an instrument of international policy.

New America

The American people must compel Congress and the President to adopt a foreign policy based on these principles:

1. No American participation in any war except in case of direct attack upon our coasts and borders and the strategic points surrounding them: i. e., the Aleutian Islands, Hawaii, the Panama Canal area, and the islands of the Carribean.

2. Imposing by Congressional action of an embargo upon loans, credits, and sale of armaments, materials for the manufacture of armaments, or materials for use in war to any nation at war except peoples struggling to free themselves from the restrictions of feudal, imperialist, and finance-monopoly controls, whether imposed from within or by military aggression from without.

3. The establishment of the principle in legislation of extending economic aid by Congressional action on a case by case basis to peoples struggling to free themselves from the restrictions of feudal, imperialist, and finance-monopoly controls, whether imposed from within or by military aggression from without. Such economic aid shall include opening of our markets and the extension of loans and credits.

4. Forbidding the use of American ships for transporting goods to such peoples.

5. Limiting American armaments and armed force to those clearly required for the defense of our coasts and borders and the strategic points surrounding them: i. e., the Aleutian Islands, Hawaii, the Panama Canal area, and the islands of the Caribbean.

6. Public ownership of the armaments industry.

7. Defeat of all industrial mobilization bills and maintenance of full civil liberties at all times.

The basis of this foreign policy must be a domestic program which will unleash the forces of production in this country and apply all of our human and natural resources to meeting the needs of the American people.

This integrated foreign and domestic program is the only means by which the American people can aid immediately the cause of democracy and peace throughout the world. To be effective it must be used with a clear understanding of its objectives and as part of the struggle of the American people at home to extend democratic control over their own economic and political system. The close interrelation between the right foreign policy and the right domestic program is clearly revealed by the fact that to cut off American resources from imperialist powers engaged in war can only become fully practical when people's control over the economic system is established in this country. Whatever the issues pressing upon America from abroad, the struggle to extend democracy at home remains the central issue facing the American people today.

World Council of Churches

[Section of a statement on the position of the churches in the matter of war, as summarized by Dr. Albert W. Palmer in a recent issue of the *Christian Century*.]

1. War is an evil and non-Christian method.

2. No decision secured by force of arms will be just.

3. Out of the evil forces thereby set in motion, more evil is bound to come.

4. Decision by negotiation, conference and methods of conciliation should always be an available alternative method.

5. Such procedures should be adopted free of the menace of force.

6. And in a spirit of humility for past mistakes which all states have committed.

7. And with a recognition that the existing status has no inherent sanctity, since the world is a living and, therefore, a changing organism.

8. But change should and can be consistent with the preservation of basic human rights.

9. These views are in harmony with the fundamental moral principles which are derived from the Christian religion.

10. We earnestly commend them to the consideration of church and political leaders.

11. The churches and all Christian people should strive to make concrete our Lord's injunction, "Love your enemies"—to spread the spirit of forgiveness and trust, to increase the habit of charitable judgment, and to widen knowledge and understanding of the causes of conflict.

12. Prayer is the supreme energy of the Christian. That prayer must be for peace and justice among the nations.

13. For the Christian to accept a counsel of despair when difficulties increase and chaos threatens is to deny faith.

14. God presides over the destinies of nations as well as of individuals. . . . The event is with God and he that doeth the will of God shall stand in the power of his might.

Dr. George A. Buttrick, President of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America

The truth and love of God are not in eclipse except as we have turned away from Him to live in our own shadow. Christ has not failed: the world is chaotic and disconsolate just because we have failed Him. Power politics and the quest for secular security are poor substitutes for His wisdom. Therefore, the duty of our Protestant churches in this tragic time is not far to seek. We now try to trace it in plain terms.

1. We shall do well to *keep unbroken our world-wide Christian fellowship.* War's hatreds must not sever the bonds by which Christians everywhere are bound to one another and to God. We must keep these bonds; they are the true girding of mankind. Christ is Truth. He cannot be parochial or national Truth. He is Truth for the world, and all men are truly one in Him.

2. American Protestantism must *lead the nation to repent, forbear, forgive, and in every word and work of reconciliation.* The command of Christ still holds that we should "love one another." This does not mean ever that we should condone evil, but renounce evil. It means that we should try to find and face the causes of war which lie deeper than the immediate occasions of war. It means that we should be charitable in judgment, clinging to the right, and resolute in good will.

3. American Protestantism must *enter into the fellowship of suffering with the millions on both sides of every battle line.* We should abhor profiteering, especially profiteering in arms and blood, and hold any government renegade that does not try effectively to curb it. Instead we should seek to lighten the world's tragic burden.

4. Our American Protestantism will do well to *strengthen our government's purpose to keep us out of war.* But our motives must be clear. It is very easy to be neutral from base motives. We must be neutral from high and costly motives; not for physical safety, nor to maintain an impossible isolation from world problems, assuredly not for commercial gain, but rather because we know war is futile and because we are eager through reconciliation to build a kindlier world.

5. *We can pray.* True prayer is not a last resort. It is not an escape. It is a beseeching that God's compassionate will may be done among men. It is a spiritual force stronger than all armies. This is the nobler energy for lack of which the world is arid and torn. Our worship during these critical times should acknowledge the kinship of all nations; our altars should be places of earnest and unremitting intercession.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 66)

Minister spoken in the last few days before and after the first few hours following the outbreak of war were most praiseworthy, recognizing the extreme gravity of the step that became inevitable, the declaration of a state of war, there was one sentence which was to be regretted: "We shall enter it with a clear conscience."

If our national conscience considers only the last few days before the final calamity fell it may perhaps feel that it is cleared. During the final attempts to induce the German government to negotiate rather than seize Danzig and the Corridor there does indeed seem to have been no ill-considered action and no fatal move or inactivity on our part. What could be done was done. Even on a view covering some months it might seem that our country had a clear conscience, though not all of us feel so certain of this. But if our searching of heart begins with June 19th, 1919, the day of the signature of the Treaty of Versailles, and then looks all down the history of the years that followed—the continuation of the blockade of Germany, the failure to keep the undertaking to disarm once Germany had disarmed, successive failures to stand firmly by the Covenant of the League of Nations which we had signed; the timorous waiting for a lead from lesser nations when a lead from Britain for disarmament or other important League of Nations policies might have turned the scale in world affairs—can we claim to go into this conflict with a clear conscience? Have we, members of the British nation, no feeling of guilt for the very fact that we temporized here and dallied there, until the friendly Germany of Herr Stresemann's government turned into the tiger Germany of Chancellor Hitler's?

Must we wait for the conclusion of peace in how many months' or years' time to realize, as we began to realize after 1919, that when a great war breaks out, neither of the parties that wage it is without sin?

Let our prayers, then, include penitence that the world has come to such a pass that once again Christian peoples take up more horrible weapons than ever before against other Christian peoples. Let us pray for the safety of all who wage this evil battle, that they be not embittered and brutalized by the bitter and brutal thing. Let us pray that God will bring peace in the way that peace may best come; not, perhaps, through any knockout blow, but by some change of heart among the responsible rulers who have projected this sad struggle, and the spontaneous insistence of the peoples who never desired it that peace shall and must be brought about by discussion.

One thing a Christian Church cannot do if it would deserve to be called Christian. It cannot inflame warlike passions among its members or among any men and women. The disciples of the Prince of Peace must follow after peace, and proclaim the duty of loving our enemies even in the midst of the conflict. The Christian must pity while he condemns; and must repent before he condemns. We do not go into war with a clean conscience.

The Christian Church must be the steadying influence in this time of crisis. Though battle rages, the Church must insist that hate is wrong, and bitterness the enemy of righteousness. Sternness there must be, but also forgiveness, and since the first casualty in warfare is Truth, the Church must proclaim itself the greatest casualty clearing station on behalf of Truth. Many things the Church will find to do in this sad hour, but one thing is essential: while the tempest rages the Church must stand for patience, fair-mindedness, wide-heartedness, and self-sacrificing love and service for all who suffer, whatever their race and nation.—*The Unitarian and Free Christian Monthly,* October, 1939.

Gandhi Reaches Seventy!

RATTAN S. SEKHON

A saintly statesman of India, a brave and unyielding pacifist, and a relentless denouncer of Bolshevism and Fascism, Mohandas Karmachand Gandhi has reached seventy. He has conquered many of the fears that mar man's happiness. Death does not threaten him, poverty is no problem with him, old age does not disgrace his lofty spirit, future uncertainties do not dim the spark of his high hopes, and no failure can shake his faith in man and in God nor drive him to bitterness and cynicism. A great admirer of Christ and a firm believer in the Sermon on the Mount, Gandhi would rather be good than great. Religion is more important to him than politics. Gandhi along with many other men shares the belief that it is men who have failed and not religion; creeds and beliefs which generate disharmony among men, not the spiritual truth which is religion. He claims no special revelation of God's will and has no desire to found a sect. He rejects the idea of being called a saint and denies that he has any divine power. But there is something in Gandhi that wins the respect even of his foes. Perhaps it is the strength of his character acquired through true living.

Gandhi is an unbending foe of British Rule in India, yet he is a true friend of England. He never fails England in her distress and always comes to her rescue whenever she is in danger. He even compromised with his pacifism to the extent of helping to send more than a million Indians to England's aid during the World War. Lending his full moral support to the Allies, Gandhi has asked Britain to relax her imperialistic grip and give India her due freedom as an evidence of Britain's good faith in democracy. Poor England! How heavily she is indebted to a man who is not even her own son.

Gandhi wants to conquer his foes and political enemies through non-violence and passive resistance and has no faith in force. It has been repeatedly brought to his attention that in this matter of fact world non-violence does not work and cannot succeed. At the time when Gandhi appeared on the political scene to take part in India's fight for freedom, the people of India, due to long continued foreign domination, were morally degenerated and physically weak. Indian society was rotten to the core. Animosity and hatred among Hindus and Mohammedans, the caste system among the Hindus, and many other social vices, stood like the Wall of China against any attempt to unify India. To steer the political destiny and to strengthen the weakened stamina of three hundred million defenceless people in a world equipped with guns and machine guns was not an easy task. Whether Gandhi believed in it or not (though he did), the only avenue open to him for the successful awakening of the politically dead mass of humanity was through non-violence and passive resistance. Whether Gandhi with his method of non-violence has made rapid progress to free India from the British Raj or whether he has actually delayed her independence, may be a disputed matter among the modern Ph. D.'s of sociology and political science, but he has rekindled the long dead flame of self-respect and the latent flame of self-determination in the bosom of every Indian.

Gandhi, with his non-violence, often exhausts the patience of his colleagues and of his army which carries on war without violence. At times he has been deserted by all of them and left alone. But never once has he ever weakened in favor of violence. Gandhi believes non-violence is a moral force which purifies and strengthens man, softens his enemy and, in the end, conquers him. Like religion, moral force cannot fail. Granting the premise that man has failed to conduct his affairs and to settle his disputes through love and understanding, it is also true that he has not succeeded with fear and force. War after war, revolution after revolution, and constant unrest in the world, witness the complete collapse of man's attempt to govern men with force.

Gandhi was born in 1869 in a small village near Bombay. His parents belonged to Vaisya caste (a class of traders) and practiced the Jain religion. At eight his betrothal took place, and at twelve Gandhi was married. At eighteen he graduated from an Indian university and sailed for England to study law in Cambridge. At twenty-three, having been admitted to the Bar, Gandhi returned to India. While in England Gandhi read Thoreau, Tolstoy, Mazzini, Plato, and more than a hundred books on Christianity including the Bible. Thus Gandhi is both an informed and an inspired man frequently accused of being a mystic. He is a very keen and shrewd man. Though he does not mistrust you he reads and detects your real and true motives hidden behind phrases of high pretenses. He is above flattery and greed. You can neither win him with praise nor bribe him with riches. He has no hunger for power. Gandhi always fights for truth and righteousness without faltering, therefore, he is known to be a stubborn and uncompromising little man. He has set himself free by mastering most of his worldly desires for power, wealth and fame, yet Gandhi is a slave to his convictions and ideals.

Once a rich lawyer, Gandhi has given all his wealth for charity. His living expenses are less than $10.00 a month and he runs the spinning wheel a few hours daily to earn them. Retired from active participation in politics Gandhi still is a guiding force of the All India National Congress. Young Indian leaders and nationalists constantly come to him for advice. He is less spectacular and more practical nowadays. No more fasts for self-purification and for the social wrongs of his people nor civil disobedience against the British Raj. Reconstruction of rural India is his main interest in life. He lives in a thatched hut in a small remodeled Indian village located in Central India. Physically an ugly man, Gandhi is a sweet person with an attractive personality. He impresses you as a man with no strength and with a very weak body. Yet he has great endurance. At the age of seventy, Gandhi is a swift walker. Even young people can hardly keep up with his brisk strides. His habits are simple and regular. He eats and sleeps very little. He rises without fail every day at 3 o'clock in the morning and attends to his correspondence. At four he meditates and prays. At 4:30 he takes his morning walk. So goes the day with him.

There is hardly a man alive in the world who has behind him as long a catalogue of unselfish actions, noble deeds, and supreme personal sacrifices to better man as has Gandhi.

Correspondence

How to Keep America Out of War

Editor of UNITY:

We would greatly appreciate a few lines in your correspondence columns to inform your readers of the publication about October 23 of my new book-sized pamphlet *How to Keep America Out of War*. Ninety-six pages in length, 40,000 words, it is being published coöperatively by seven peace agencies: American Friends Service Committee, Peace Section, 20 South 12th Street, Philadelphia; Fellowship of Reconciliation, 2929 Broadway, New York City, and 1902 Blakemore, Nashville, Tennessee, and 529 East Orange Grove Avenue, Pasadena, California; General Conference Commission on World Peace of the Methodist Episcopal Church, 740 Rush Street, Chicago; Keep America Out of War Congress, 22 East 17th Street, New York City; National Council for Prevention of War, 532 Seventeenth Street, N. W., Washington, D. C., and 134 Chestnut Street, Springfield, Massachusetts, and 612 Stock Exchange Building, Portland, Oregon; War Resisters League, 171 West 12th Street, New York City; Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 1924 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.

Copies may be ordered from any of these agencies or from me at the following rates: Fifteen cents per copy postpaid, 12 copies $1.00 postpaid, 50 copies $2.50 postpaid, 100 copies $5.00 postpaid. Consignments of 50 or more copies will be sent without cash in advance for sale at forums, classes, services, and meetings, with the privilege of returning copies not sold or given away. The sale of 34 copies at 15 cents each will provide the cost of $5.00 of the hundred copies, and the remaining 66 copies may be given to strategic community leaders. Because of the importance and urgency of the task of keeping America out of war, we seek the coöperation of your readers in this non-commercial and non-profit venture. Requests for consignments without advance payment should be sent to me at La Habra, Box 247.

KIRBY PAGE.

La Habra, California.

A Letter from Sweden

Editor of UNITY:

. . . Europe is in chaos worse than any time before Hitler. He must be an incarnation of the devil!

So far we are a free country, but nobody knows how things will develop. There is much unrest among the people here. The news is wearing down the nerves.

I do not know what will happen to the Germans if they lose this war. People talk about exterminating the whole populace of Germany. They say so long as there are any Germans left, there will be no peace in the world.

We in Sweden are a peace-loving people, but we would rather die than live under the rule of Naziism.

H. P. M.

Stockholm, Sweden.

Franz Ferdinand and Sarajevo

Editor of UNITY:

In an article in The Field, August 7th issue, on the distinguished Serbian statesman, Jovan Jovanovitch, it is stated: "Overstepping diplomatic etiquette, he begged the Austrian government not to send Franz Ferdinand on his visit to Sarajevo, which ended in his assassination."

I desire to draw your attention to the discrepancy between this statement and the real fact, not in a spirit of depreciation of the value of this statesman, but out of respect for historical truth.

There should be no inconsiderate publications on the subject of this assassination, responsible for such dire, unmeasurable results—war, unrest, and war again, still prevalent.

Mr. Jovan Jovanovitch could never have given such advice to the Austrian government. Had he done so, it would have been in contradiction to the policy of his government. His government was well informed of the conspiracy to assassinate Franz Ferdinand and even of the day of departure from Belgrade of the arch conspirator, Printzip, for Sarajevo. The Serbian government failed to inform the Austrian of this fact.

On the celebration of the tenth anniversary of the peace, a pamphlet was published containing nine articles by distinguished Serbian statesmen. The first is by Luba Jovanovitch, minister of education in Pashitch's cabinet at the time of the assassination. In it he relates in detail what he knew of the assassin and the conspiracy. He knew him personally, had received visits from him, had spoken with him on the eve of his departure on his special mission for Sarajevo. This he communicated to the cabinet council, which resulted in a telegram being sent to the frontier authorities to stop him. *He had already passed.* With this full knowledge of the proceedings of the assassins, the Serbian government failed to inform the Austrian of the extreme danger the duke ran. All these details are given in the pamphlet in question. This pamphlet is entitled: "1914-1924. In Memory of the Tenth Anniversary of the World War. With 9 articles and 16 portraits. Belgrade, 1924."

P. M. MATTHIEFF

Sofia, Bulgaria

UNITY the Best of All!

Editor of UNITY:

May I say that I think UNITY is about the best of the thirty-odd magazines I am receiving. More power to you in days like these!

B.

Wilton, Conn.

John Haynes Holmes
Editor

UNITY

Curtis W. Reese
Managing Editor

Introducing UNITY to new readers, we offer a trial subscription of

6 MONTHS for $1.00

A Journal of Free and Critical Opinion

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY. REGULAR SUBSCRIPTION $3.00.

UNITY, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago

Please enter my subscription for a trial period of six months, for which I enclose $1.00.

Name..... Street.....

City..... State.....

$10 Reward

will be paid to the first Christian minister who expresses for publication his belief or disbelief in each of the doctrines of his own religion as published in

THE ARBITRATOR

which has for twenty years attacked Christianity only to be told that it is jousting at a straw man as no one believes the ancient theological dogmas any longer.

AN EVOLUTIONARY PHILOSOPHY offers a substitute for Religion. 10 cents, including copy of The Arbitrator.

THE ARBITRATOR

114 E. 31st St., New York City